19th August 1955] [Sri M. A. Manickavelu]

Rs. 300 and A and B pay Rs. 300. That means it comes to Rs. 600. The idea is not that. Suppose the joint patta is for argument's sake half and half. Then A's share is Rs. 150 and B's share is Rs. 150. Then it comes to Rs. 300 + 150 = 450. So he will not be liable to pay the surcharge. In order to clarify the position, this amendment is brought and nothing more, Sir.''

DEPUTY SPEAKER :—'' Motion moved—

'That the Madras Land Revenue (Surcharge) Amendment Bill, 1955, be taken into consideration at once.' ''

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—'' Sir, the very fact that there was conflict between the original provision and the illustration was pointed out by us when the original Act was passed. At that time, the Government did not choose to accept our position. Now that they have accepted it, we have no objection.'' 12-30 p.m.

DEPUTY SPEAKER :—'' The question is—

'That the Madras Land Revenue (Surcharge) Amendment Bill, 1955, be taken into consideration.' ''

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was taken into consideration.

DEPUTY SPEAKER :—'' There are no amendments. I shall put the Clauses and the Preamble to the vote of the House.

Clauses 1 and 2 and the Preamble were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU :—'' Sir, I move—

'*That the Madras Land Revenue (Surcharge) Amendment Bill, 1955, be passed.*' ''

DEPUTY SPEAKER :—'' The question is—

'That the Madras Land Revenue (Surcharge) Amendment Bill, 1955, be passed.' ''

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

(5) THE PUDUKKOTTAI (SETTLEMENT OF INAMS) BILL, 1955.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU :—'' Sir, I beg to introduce the Pudukkottai (Settlement of Inams) Bill , 1955 and move—

'*That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.*'

'' The settlement of inams in the erstwhile Pudukkottai State was made generally on the lines similar to those in the Madras State. In this State, the Inam Rules printed as Appendix I to Chapter IV of B.S.O., Volume II, were the basis of inam settlement by the

* Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 2nd March 1955.

Inam Commissioner. There are three inam Acts in force in this State. They are (1) Act IV of 1862; (2) Act IV of 1866; and (3) Act VIII of 1869. They are very limited in scope and do not cover the various points that are likely to come up in a fresh settlement. Matters like the resumption and reassignment of the several kinds of inams have been provided for in Board's Standing Orders 52 to 65. The Inam Rules in force in this State are only executive orders and have no legal sanction. The validity of the action taken under the Inam Rules and Board's Standig Orders, however, does not appear to have been questioned, but in view of the complex nature of the inam tenures under the merged State and in view of the possibility of the litigation and legal difficulties that might crop up in the event of settlement with reference to executive orders in force in this State, the need for a special legislation is felt.

" We have been working out this scheme of abolition under the rules prevalent in our State. But as far as the Pudukkottai State is concerned, they have passed certain executive orders and they have been followed. Anybody may question at any time that there is no valid legislation and that it is not legally binding. In order to prevent any such cropping up of difficulties, we are regularising the rules already in existence by providing this legislation."

DEPUTY SPEAKER :—" Motion moved—

' That the Pudukkottai (Settlement of Inams) Bill, 1955, be taken into consideration at once.' "

* SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do not object to the proposal of the Hon. the Revenue Minister, but I would like to know why the two Jaghirs of Manovirthi and Chinnaranmanai have been excluded from the operation of the Bill."

DEPUTY SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member moving his amendment? "

* SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" Sir, there is no amendment standing in my name. I am speaking on the main Bill.

" Now, coming to my point, I would like to know whether these two Jagirs have been excluded in the rules relating to inams made by the former Pudukkottai Durbar. If they had not been excluded then, may I know why they should be excluded now."

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU :—" Sir, I think the hon. Member himself is not sure whether these two Jaghirs have been included or excluded. What I wish to submit is that we are working the scheme of abolition and whatever rules apply here, will apply to the Pudukkottai State also. We consider that the inams in Pudukkottai should be settled on the same lines as in Madras. We are not making any new rules. To put it in a nutshell, we are only adopting the ' Rubber stamp ' policy in respect of Pudukkottai State." (Laughter.)

19th August 1955]

* SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" Sir, Clause 6 of the Bill says ' Nothing in this Act shall apply to the two Jaghirs, Manovirthi and Chinnaranmanai '. I wish to know why they have been excluded. If they have been excluded in the rules framed by the former Pudukkottai Darbar, then I agree with the Hon. Minister."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU :—" Sir, I cannot exactly say now as to why they have been excluded. I will have that point examined."

* SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—" கனம் மந்திரி அவர்களே அதற்கு என்ன காரணம் என்று தெரியவில்லையென்று சொல்கிறார்கள். அதனாலே நாளைக்கு அந்தக் காரணம் என்ன என்று தெரிந்தபிறகு இந்த மசோதாவை விவாதத்திற்கு எடுத்துக்கொள்ளலாம். இத்துடன் இன்றைய சபைக் கூட்டத்தை நிறுத்திவைக்குமாறு கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்."

DEPUTY SPEAKER :—" The House is now adjourned and will meet again at 8-30 a.m. to-morrow."

The House then adjourned.

VII.—PAPER PLACED ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

Notification issued with G.O. *Ms. No.* 1813, *Home, dated* 28*th June* 1955, *regarding amendment to the levy of fee for issue of duplicate composition certificate.* [*Laid on the table under section* 16 (5) *of the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods Act*, 1952.]

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS